

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-37 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 4 and 15 have been inserted into claim 1. Otherwise, the claims have been amended to improve the form thereof.

#### Drawings Objection

The drawings have been objected to as it is asserted in the Office Action that the elements “19L” in Figure 4(b), as well as elements “19N, 20N, and 21N” in Figure 4(d), are not mentioned in the specification. First, it is noted that at page 61 in the first full paragraph element “19L” is indeed mentioned. Second, it is noted that the specification has been amended at page 61, lines 13-15 such that this sentence reads: “The width of this resin flow is increased from M-M’ to N-N’ in Fig 4 (19N, 20N and 21N) and is reduced downstream beneath N-N’ in Fig 4.” In this regard, it is submitted that the description in the present specification and drawings, including the context of Figure 4(d), make it clear that these elements would have been readily understood by one skilled in the art upon review of the present specification and drawings. Therefore, it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

#### Abstract Objection

The Abstract has been replaced with a shorter version that is under 150 words. Thus, the previous objection to the Abstract for being too lengthy should be withdrawn.

#### Issues under 35 USC 112

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because of the definitions of Z, XA1, and XA2.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because of the term “derivative”.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because of the phrase “substantially”.

Regarding claims 8 and 17, these claims have been amended so as to insert appropriate definitions and delete the term “derivative”, respectfully, such that these issues have been resolved. Concerning claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that the term “substantially” is appropriate. Note that page 38, lines 3-12 and page 35, line 20 to page 36, line 4 support the use of this term. In this regard, such a term allows for the presence of some particles, but not enough to negatively affect the properties of the claimed film. Also, note that this term has been accepted by the courts. *In re Mattison*, 509 F.2d 563, 184 USPQ 484 (CCPA 1975). Therefore, it is requested that all of these rejections be withdrawn.

Issues under 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 10-19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hebrink ‘182 (US Publication No. 2001/0019182) taken in view of evidence given by Arends ‘659 (US Patent 5,360,659).

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hebrink ‘182 in view of Weber ‘897 (US Patent 6,025,897).

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hebrink ‘182.

First, it is noted that upon the insertion of claim 4 into claim 1, the basis for the anticipation rejection over Hebrink ‘182 in view of Arends ‘659 has been removed and should be withdrawn.

The remaining above rejections are traversed based on the following reasons.

Present Invention and Its Advantages

The present invention is directed to a multilayer film formed from alternate thermoplastic layers A and B, wherein these layers have the same basic skeleton. This film exhibits a reflectance peak before and after heating at 150°C for 30 minutes which differs by no greater than 15%. Also, the difference in reflectance between peaks of reflection in different locations in the width direction is within  $\pm 10\%$ . The film of the present invention exhibits advantageous properties. As evidenced by the examples and the comparative test results shown in Tables 1-7

in the present specification, the film embodiments of the present invention (Examples 1-23) exhibit advantageously improved reflectance, dimensional evenness, scratch resistance and resistance to layer separation properties over Comparative Examples 1-6 which do not include the inventive features.

Distinctions over Cited References

Hebrink '182 discloses methods and apparatuses for making multilayer optical films. Hebrink '182 mentions in paragraphs [0138] and [0145] some processing conditions which affect reflectance properties. Hebrink '182 discloses a desire to obtain thickness uniformity in a widthwise direction at paragraph [0077], but fails to specifically identify a method to do so. Hebrink '182 also mentions some examples of thermoplastic layers in paragraphs [0057] and [0058] with reference to uniaxially oriented films.

Hebrink '182 fails to disclose or suggest a multilayer film that exhibits a reflectance peak before and after heating at 150°C for 30 minutes which differs by no greater than 15%, as in the present invention. Hebrink '182 further fails to disclose or suggest a difference in reflectance between peaks of reflection in different locations in the width direction that is within  $\pm 10\%$ , as in the present invention. Further, the uniaxially oriented thermoplastic films mentioned in Hebrink '182 must shrink in the oriented direction upon application of heat, such that it is not possible to satisfy the requirement that a reflectance peak differ by no greater than 15% after heating, as in the present invention. Consequently, significant patentable distinctions exist between the present invention and Hebrink '182, such that the above rejections based on this reference must be withdrawn.

In addition, it is submitted that Weber '897 fails to make up for the deficiencies of Hebrink '182, such that even an attempt to combine these references together fails to disclose or suggest the features of the claimed film of the present invention. Thus, the rejection based on Weber '897 and Hebrink '182 must also be withdrawn.


In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned, Andrew D. Meikle, at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Andrew D. Meikle  
Registration No.: 32,868  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant